REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action of April 1, 2008 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks presented in this response.

Claims 1, 2 and 9-16 were pending in this application. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2 and 9-16. In this Amendment and Remarks in response to the Office Action, the Applicant has not amended any claims. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 12-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al., (US 6018343, filed 09/27/1996).

Regarding Claim 1, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's grounds for rejection. Claim 1 recites:

> "said form content and said HTML content are ... displayed in a
> Java applet execution in a browser in said common window... said
> Java applet execution providing browsing capabilities between
> different pages of HTML content displayed in said Java applet
> execution. "

Wang fails to disclose this recitation. Wang rather describes "a Web Calendar implemented as an applet in Java." *See* Col. 4, ll. 28-30; Fig. 3. Wang teaches that "a Java applet [implementing the Web Calendar] can be included in an HTML document and can be retrieved from any Java enabled Web browser." *See* Col. 6, ll. 11-14. All excerpts of Wang cited in the Office Action describe embodiments where a Java Applet (branded as a Capplet™) displays a web calendar with various features, such as event association and others. *See* Col. 6, ll. 56-67. However, Wang at no point discloses or implies that form content and HTML content are combined and displayed in execution of the Java applet. In fact, Wang actually discloses that HTML should not be used: Wang purports that "[i]n contrast to a Web Calendar implemented in HTML, the applet calendar provides flexibility and capability where the HTML approach is lacking." *See* Col. 6, ll. 14-16; *see e.g.*, col. 6, ll. 8-22. In other words, Wang discloses an HTML page containing a Java applet, but does not disclose HTML and form content combined

and displayed inside a Java applet. Wang simply does not contemplate the recited feature of claim 1.

Furthermore, as explained in the preceding paragraph, since Wang does not disclose or imply a Java applet (*i.e.*, a Capplet™) combining and displaying HTML content and form content, Wang simply cannot disclose any "browsing capabilities between different pages of HTML content." Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Wang.

Regarding Claims 2, 9-10, 12-13, and 16, the Applicant traverses the rejection in the Office Action for at least the same reasons as those stated for Claim 1. For example, Claim 9 recites that "[a] processor [combines and outputs] ... form content from a Java applet and HTML content from said Java applet ... and said Java applet provides browsing capabilities." For example, Claim 12 recites that "said HTML content is rendered and controlled by said Java applet and rendered inside said Java execution ... [and] said Java applet provides browsing capabilities." Wang does not teach, suggest, or imply these recited limitations. Accordingly, Claims 2, 9-10, 12-13, and 16 are allowable over Wang.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 11, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Wang et al. (US 6018343, filed 09/27/1996) in view of Minard (US 6247020, filed 12/1997).

Regarding Claims 11, 14, and 15, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds for rejection in the Office Action. Wang and Minard, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or imply the recited feature in those claims. The Applicant outlined the numerous deficiencies in Minard in a prior Office Action response that was filed January 4, 2008 and which the Examiner subsequently stated had been fully considered and was persuasive. *See* Office Action mailed April 1, 2008, p. 12. Furthermore, the Applicant has described the numerous deficiencies in Wang with respect to the parent claims of Claims 11, 14, and 15. Therefore, Claims 11, 14, and 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend, and for those reasons stated in the prior Office Action response. Accordingly, Claims 11, 14, and 15 are allowable over Wang in view of Minard.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration of all pending claims in the application is respectfully requested. All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request prompt notification of the same.

The Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733 for any fees due in connection with the filing of this response.

If the Examiner should have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _June 17, 2008_____

By:_____/Aseet Patel/_____
Aseet Patel
Registration No. 53,874
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001